DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 678 HE 010 392

AUTHOR Belock, Shirley
TITLE A Comparison of the Grade Point Averages of Freshman Students Living in Dormitories with the Grade Point Averages of Commuting Students at Castleton State College.
PUB DATE 23 Jun 78
NOTE 35p.; Best available copy; A practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Commuting Students; *Grade Point Average; Higher Education; *Predictor Variables; Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS *Castleton State College VT; *On Campus Students

ABSTRACT

It was hypothesized that students living in campus dormitories would have a significantly higher grade point average than students commuting to colleges. The population used in the study consisted of freshman students completing their first academic year during the spring of 1976, 1977, and 1978. The means of the grade point averages for each year were determined and statistically compared by T-test. The results for the years 1976 and 1977 indicate significant differences in the means of the grade point averages, but 1978 data indicate no significant differences. The hypothesis was proved to be incorrect; the means of the commuting student were significantly higher. It is concluded that the commuting student does better, or equally as well, as the dormitory student as indicated by the means of the grade point averages. (Author/LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED158678

A COMPARISON OF THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF FRESHMAN STUDENTS LIVING IN DORMITORIES WITH THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF COMMUTING STUDENTS AT CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley Belock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

SOCIETAL FACTORS

by

Shirley Belock, M.A.

Castleton State College
Castleton, Vermont

DR. ARMAND DESMARAIS
CLUSTER COORDINATOR

BRISTOL CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JUNE 23, 1978

HE010392

A COMPARISON OF THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF FRESHMAN STUDENTS LIVING IN DORMITORIES WITH THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF COMMUTING STUDENTS AT CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE

SOCIETAL FACTORS BRISTOL CLUSTER

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to compare the grade point averages of the dormitory resident student with the grade point averages of the commuting student. The hypothesis tested was: Students living in campus dormitories would have a significantly higher grade point average than students commuting to the college. The population used in the study consisted of freshman students completing their first academic year during the spring of 1976, 1977, and 1978. The means of the grade point averages for each year were determined and statistically compared through the use of the t test. The results for the years 1976 and 1977 indicates there is a significant difference in the means of the grade point averages. However, the 1978 results indicates no significant difference between the means of the grade point averages of dormitory or commuting students. The data proves the hypothesis, as stated, is incorrect. Instead of the dormitory student's grade point average mean being higher, the means of the commuting student proves to be significantly higher. It is concluded, therefore, that the commuting student does better, or equally as well, as the dormitory student as indicated by the means of the grade point averages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE 6

HYPOTHESIS 9

3. PROCEDURE 10

DEFINITION OF TERMS 10

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 11

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS 11

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING THE DATA 12

PROCEDURE FOR TREATING THE DATA 13

4. RESULTS 14

5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 19

REFERENCES CITED 22

APPENDIX 23

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t-test. Spring 1976 . . . 16

2. The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t-test. Spring 1977 . . . 17

3. The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t-test. Spring 1978 . . . 18

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

As a small four year college in rural Vermont, Castleton State College has the mission of meeting the needs of individuals desiring to persue higher education. The college has been authorized by the Board of Trustees of the Vermont State College system to grant two year associate and four year baccalaureate degrees.

In 1974 the college adopted an open admission policy which allows any Vermonter who holds a high school diploma to be admitted. Thus, many students granted admission do not have the necessary prerequisites to be successful in college level work. Remediation has been offered in english, mathematics, and study skills. However, the student, identified as needing assistance, was not required to complete the remediation courses. If the student does choose to take the classes, he/she may also enroll in other college level courses at the same time.

Recently an ad hoc committee was formed to study the issue of the high risk, remedial student in an effort to reduce the attrition rate and to increase the success and retention of these students. The main emphasis of the committee has been to study the lack of specific skills, such as reading and writing, and how these skills could be improved. However, the lack of skills may be only one facet of the problem. Students

who do not succeed and/or leave the college before earning a degree may do so because of many other reasons.

One factor may possibly be the environment that the student finds him or herself living in. The student may continue to live with his/her parents, rent an apartment, or live in the college dormitories. If the student was a commuter he/she may be handicapped because he/she do not have the added interaction with other students and faculty that would be conducive to an environment that would lead to successful learning. However, if the student lives on campus, dormitory life can be an entirely new social environment which adds new and different stresses. These stresses may have an undesirable effect on the student and his/her ability to learn.

The college maintains dormitories on its premises for approximately 450 full time day students. Approximately one half of the freshman and one third of the upper classman have choosen to live on campus in the dormitories during the past few years.

This study addressed the issue as to whether the living environment has an effect on student learning in the first crucial year of college. The study compared the grade point averages of full time freshman students living on campus for the complete academic year with the grade point averages of the full time commuting student at the end of their first year.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Castleton State College is a small liberal arts college, one of five colleges in the Vermont State College system. The college is located in rural Vermont with a student population of approximately 1000 full time day students. The college draws the majority of students from predominantly white middle class families living in small or rural communities. In most instances the student is the first generation to attend an institution of higher learning. Few minority groups are represented because of the makeup of the Vermont population. In Vermont, less than one percent fall into those categories identified as minority groups, other than women, by the federal government.

The college has been authorized to grant two year associate degrees and four year baccalaureate degrees in the liberal arts and a limited number of professional/career programs. The college also offers a Master of Arts in Education and has been moving toward offering a Masters in Business Administration.

Castleton State College considers itself to be a community college, attempting to meet the educational needs of the surrounding community and the southern section of Vermont. In meeting the need for higher education, a policy of open admission for all high school graduates from Vermont,

regardless of academic preparation, was adopted and implemented in 1974. The adoption of this policy was greeted with mixed emotions by the faculty. They were concerned because of the lack of academic preparation of many of the students who would enter, the lack of planning by the college to offer a formalized remediation program, and if quality of instruction was to be maintained than these students would probably soon be labeled as failures. The attrition rate of these students has been high. Some students left soon after classes started, many others failed to maintain the academic standing required to continue in the college, and a few others have been able to continue, but are working at a minimum level.

Faculty have attempted to assist these poorly prepared students by offering remedial courses in english, mathematics, and study skills. However, any academic gains made in these courses has met with limited success because the student was allowed to enroll in regular college courses before completing remediation.

The president of the college, in a recent address to the faculty, stated that all entering freshman students should live in the dormitories during their first year. He felt that student academic success would than be enhanced through a living/learning environment. However, prior to implementing this policy, the president charged the faculty to plan and prepare a formal program in remediation.

In response to this charge an ad hoc committee on remediation was formed in the fall of 1977. The ad hoc

committee's main emphasis was to determine which skills students needed to be successful in college level work, which skills the poorly prepared student was deficient in, and how these skills could be improved. Other facets of the student and his background were not included in their deliberations. Perhaps there were other societal factors that were as important, or even more so, than the lack of skills that the student would demonstrate. Such factors could include social/cultural environment, economic status, motivation, age, sex, or marital status.

The student was a product of all of these environmental aspects. Not all students leave the college because of their lack of academic skills. Students who do not succeed and/or leave the college before earning a degree may do so because of a variety of factors. One of these factors may be the living environment that the student finds him or herself in while attending the college.

The college maintains dormitories that hold approximately 450 students. The student has the option of where he/she lives during the academic year. The student may continue to live with his or her parents, rent an apartment, or live in the college dormitories. However, all of these living accomadations may cause learning environmental problems.

The commuter student may find himself handicapped in learning because of the lack of interaction with faculty and other students. Thus, an environment that would be conducive to successful learning may not be created and the remedial student, needing this added interaction, would fall behind.

The student would thus receive an academic grade that possibly would not reflect his/her potential.

The dormitory student may have other problems. A student entering a college setting for the first time may find dormitory life an entirely new social environment. Creating new and different stresses which may be difficult to cope with. These stresses may have an undesirable effect on the student and his/her ability to learn.

This study addressed the issue as to whether the living environment had an effect on student academic learning during the first critical year of college attendance. The study was conducted to determine which type of living environment was more conducive to academic learning: Dormitory or off campus living.

Review of Literature

Dormitory life has changed considerably over the past twenty years in colleges and universities in the United States. Prior to 1960, rigid standards and rules for all students residing in dormitories were maintained. These rules and regulations had the effect of eliminating distractions and encouraging students to pursue academic and cultural aspects under direct guidance of the college or university.

Today, however, Dressel (1976) cited that dormitories have become little more than rented facilities for students. He feels that dormitory life does interfere with studies and may weaken, rather than reinforce, the education of students.

The Carnegie Commission (1974) reported that the poorly prepared or unmotivated student would have a direct effect on other students. They identified these students as the "reluctant attendees (132)." These students were individuals who were not fully committed to college attendance and comprised approximately thirty percent of the student population. They were dissatisfied with their situation and thus caused a deterioration in the campus atmosphere. This particular student continued to stay with in the college environment for a variety of reasons, creating problems that were not easy to resolve beacuse of their disrupting influence.

The academically poorly prepared commuter student, even though desiring a college education, may have problems also because of his/her outlook on life. Rouche and Kirk (1973) cited that the male commuter student has a more negative perception of himself and his world. He was less socially mature and autonomous, felt he could not learn, had always failed and, therefore, would fail again. The student ensures this philosophy by not interacting any more than was necessary with other students and faculty, usually coming on campus just before class commenced and left immediately after its completion.

Other authors perused felt that dormitory life does have a direct positive relationship on how well the student does academically. Peterson (1975) cited that the college student living on campus had a significant educational advantage over the commuting student. Astin (1977) opined that students living in dormitories have more opportunities and incentives

to do well because they were more involved in campus activities, had more contact with faculty, did better academically and were more satisfied with college life. Chickering (1974) cited that the self-esteem of commuting students would suffer in comparison with students living on campus, which would have an adverse affect on how well the student would do academically.

Call (1974) and Buckonski (1975) conducted studies comparing dormitory students grade point averages with those earned by the commuter student. Their conclusions were that the commuter student, not the dormitory student, earned higher grade point averages.

In summary, the literature appeared to be divided as to which living environment was more conducive to academic learning. Perhaps the fact that colleges no longer exert direct control over college life, as was the case prior to 1960, has been a negative influence. Disruptive dormitory students and other contravening factors have been allowed to continue unabated, thus learning may have been effected negatively.

It would appear, however, that living on campus, interacting with faculty and other students more frequently and freely, would significantly enhance student learning. This fact would be demonstrated possibly through the student receiving a higher grade point average. Therefore, this study was conducted to identify any significant differences that had occurred between the grade point averages of the commuting and the dormitory student.

Hypothesis

From the review of literature and the background study the following hypothesis was formulated: Students living in campus dormitories will have a significantly higher grade point average than students commuting to the college.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURE

The definition of terms used in the study, the limitations of the study, basic assumptions concerning the study, the procedure for collecting the data, and the procedure for treating the collected data were as follows:

Definition of terms

Commuter Student: A student who does not live on campus and must provide transportation to and from the campus for classes.

Dormitory Student: A student paying a fee to the college for room and board during the academic year and lives on campus.

Freshman Year: The student who has attempted no less than twenty-four, and no more than thirty-four credit hours for the academic year. The student has not attended any other institution of higher learning.

Full Time Student: The student attempting twelve to seventeen credit hours of classes in each semester.

Grade Point Average: Determined by adding the number of grade points for all courses taken and dividing by the number of credits attempted by the student.

Part Time Student: The student attempting less than twelve credit hours per semester.

Limitations of the study

The limitations of the study were determined to be as follows:

1. The number of students were limited. Included in the study were students from only one college, and one class level, i.e., the freshman student.

2. The college was rural in nature, with less than one percent of students coming from minority groups, other than women. Therefore, the results of the study would not necessarily be true in another similar study. Thus, the study excluded external validity.

3. No provisions were made to determine other variables that may bias the results. Examples of variables included: age, sex, marital status, cultural and economic environment, goals of the student, motivation, maturity, and student learning style.

Basic assumptions

The following basic assumptions were made in conducting the study:

1. The groups of commuter and dormitory students were socially homogenous in nature.

2. Students with similar grade point averages and class standings were similar in academic ability.

3. The grade point averages can be realistically measured.

4. Variables such as age, sex, cultural and economic background, motivation, maturity, etc., did not effect the study.

5. Students in the sample populations were representative of students that may enter the college in the future.

6. A t-test was a reliable statistical test to determine the difference between the means of the grade point averages of the commuting and dormitory students.

Procedure for collecting the data

The population for the study was identified as those individuals who were freshman, full time day students. The registrar provided master lists that included all freshman students who had earned between twenty-four and thirty-four semester credit hours at the end of the academic years 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78. These lists included and did not differentiate between commuter and dormitory students.

The names of freshman dormitory residents were obtained from the office of the Dean for Student Affairs. Students were than identified as being commuter or dormitory residence.

To control intervening variables that may bias the study the following types of students were than excluded from the sample population:

1. Students transferring in college credits, or having attended other post secondary institutions as indicated on their transcripts.

2. Students living only part of the academic year in the dormitories.

3. Students taking less than twelve credits for either semester were considered as part time students.

4. Students enrolling for more than seventeen credits either semester were considered as taking an overload and were considered to be more than a full time student.

The grade point averages for the identified students at the completion of their freshman year were obtained from the registrar. The number of credits earned by each student and his/her grade point average for both dormitory and commuter student have been included in the appendix.

Procedure for treating the data

The null hypothesis tested was: There will be no significant difference between the means of the grade point averages of the commuter or dormitory student.

The collected data was statistically tested by comparing the means of the grade point averages of the commuting and the dormitory students for the years 1976, 1977, and 1978. The statistical method used in determining the significance between the means was calculated by utilizing the t-test, as described by Tuckman (1972). The null hypothesis would be rejected at the .05 level of significance for a two tailed test. The .05 level of significance was chosen because there was a 95 percent possibility that the difference identified would not be due to chance, but to the difference of the living accommodations of the students.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The null hypothesis tested was: There will be no significant difference between the means of the grade point averages of the commuting or dormitory student.

Table 1, on page 16, illustrates the means of the commuting and dormitory students completing their freshman year in the spring of 1976. The table includes the Standard Deviation and the results of the t-test as applied to the means of the grade point averages of the two groups.

The results of the t-test produced a value of t of 2.94. The value of t was more than the critical t value of 1.96, indicating that the null hypothesis could be rejected.

Table 2, On page 17, demonstrates the means, Standard Deviation, and results of the t-test as applied to the means of the grade point averages of freshman commuter and dormitory students in the spring of 1977.

The results of the t-test produced a t value of 2.40. The value of t was more than the critical t value of 1.96, indicating that the null hypothesis had to be rejected.

The results of the freshman sample population of 1978 was illustrated in Table 3, on page 18. The table includes the Standard Deviation, and the results of the t-test that was applied to the means of the commuting and dormitory student's grade point averages.

The results of the t-test for the 1978 groups produced a t value of 1.00. The t value was less than the critical t value of 1.96. The results indicated that, in this instance, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The results of the completed computations were that for the 1976 and 1977 sample groups there was a significant difference between the means of the grade point averages of the commuting and dormitory students. However, the 1978 results indicated no significant difference between those students.

Table 1

The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t-test Spring 1976

Groups	Student N	Grade Point Averages X	SD	t value*
Commuting Students	103	2.64	1.14	2.94
Dormitory Students	167	2.17		

* Critical t value at the .05 level of significance was 1.96

Table 2

The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t test Spring 1977

Groups	Student N	Grade Point Averages X	SD	t value*
Commuting Students	79	2.66	0.67	2.40
Dormitory Students	117	2.42		

* Critical t value at the .05 level of significance was 1.96

Table 3

The Number of Students, the Means of the Grade Point Averages, Standard Deviation, and the Results of the t-test Spring 1978

Groups	Student N	Grade Point Averages X	SD	t value*
Commuting Students	98	2.37	1.00	1.21
Dormitory Students	130	2.20		

* Critical t value at the .05 level of significance was 1.96

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the conduction of the study and the resultant findings the null hypothesis was rejected in the sample groups for 1976 and 1977, indicating that there was a significant difference between the means of the groups. Upon further examination of the collected data, however, the hypothesis as stated was erroneous. The hypothesis stated that: Students living in campus dormitories would have a significantly higher grade point average than students commuting to the college.

The results of the 1976 and 1977 groups demonstrated that the means of the grade point averages of the commuter student surpassed those earned by the dormitory student. The dormitory student means were; 2.17 (1976) and 2.42 (1977), where as the commuter students were significantly higher; 2.64 (1976) and 2.66 (1977). These findings illustrated that commuting to campus apparantly enhanced learning, or the learning environment the student lived in was better than that found in the campus dormitories. Other possible variables which had been cited in the literature were that the student had deliberatly chosen to commute due to financial or family concerns, may be an older and more mature individual who rejected dormitory life, or was highly motivated in attaining the prescribed goals he/she had set.

These results were similar to the conclusions of Call (1974) and Bukonski (1975). Their conclusions were that the commuter student did much better than the dormitory student, as indicated by the commuter receiving a higher grade point average.

The testing of the means of the sample groups of 1978 demonstrated a different outcome. The results of the 1978 groups indicated that there was not a significant difference between the two groups. Conceivably there was an intervening variable that may have created this change. The college, during the past year, had instituted student resident advisors in each dormitory, possibly the addition of this individual had aided in creating an atmosphere more conducive to learning. However, further study would have to be undertaken before concrete conclusions could be made as to what caused the change in the differences between the two means.

Recommendations from this study were identified as follows:

1. Enlarge the scope of the study to include all class levels and other variables of campus and commuter life. Examples of other variables would be: age, years since graduation from high school, marital and parental status, participation in extra curricular activities, full or part time employment, family background, cultural/economic background, sex, and learning style.

2. Students should not be required to live on campus during their freshman year until such a time it could be

demonstrated that dormitory living does enhance learning. The results of the study indicated that the commuter did equally as well, or better than students living in the dormitories. Thus, the present policy of allowing the student the option of living either on or off campus should be continued.

3. The dormitory situation, as it now exists, should be studied to determine whether distractions or other environmental factors are interferring with student learning. Perhaps alterations within the existing environment could be made that would enhance student learning, or, possibly, other alternatives could be explored for students needing living accommodations in the community surrounding the college.

REFERENCES CITED

Astin, Alexander.
1977 Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Hossey-Bass.

Bukonski, Joseph E.
1975 Societal Factors: An analysis of Selected Factors of Dormitory Students and Commuting Students at Johnson and Wales College. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 127 869 (June).

Call, Richard M.
1974 A Comparison of Resident Student's Quality Point Averages with those of Commuting Students. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 094 809 (June)

Carnegie Commission.
1974 A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chickering, Arthur.
1974 Commuting Versus Resident Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dressel, Paul.
1976 Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, Nancy.
1975 Commuting Student Lacks Advantages of Dormitory Resident. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 122 720 (December).

Rouche, John and R. Wade Kirk.
1973 Catching Up: Remedial Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tuckman, Bruce.
1972 Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

APPENDIX

SPRING 1976 - DORMITORY STUDENTS
N = 167

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
29	4.00	25	2.88	30	2.40
30	3.90	26	2.86	31	2.38
32	3.90	26	2.86	24	2.37
31	3.80	27	2.83	24	2.37
29	3.75	27	2.81	27	2.37
24	3.71	30	2.80	28	2.35
34	3.61	24	2.76	29	2.34
31	3.61	25	2.76	27	2.33
30	3.60	30	2.76	30	2.30
24	3.57	28	2.75	27	2.29
27	3.55	31	2.74	24	2.28
34	3.55	28	2.73	24	2.28
29	3.52	33	2.72	24	2.25
33	3.50	25	2.72	24	2.25
28	3.46	32	2.71	24	2.25
27	3.44	31	2.70	29	2.24
30	3.43	26	2.69	32	2.23
29	3.42	26	2.69	24	2.22
27	3.40	28	2.69	26	2.15
30	3.40	28	2.67	24	2.14
31	3.38	27	2.66	30	2.13
29	3.37	24	2.62	29	2.13
30	3.36	29	2.62	25	2.12
31	3.35	28	2.60	27	2.11
26	3.34	30	2.60	29	2.10
31	3.32	25	2.56	30	2.10
30	3.26	30	2.56	26	2.07
24	3.25	27	2.55	24	2.05
31	3.22	27	2.55	27	2.03
30	3.20	27	2.55	25	2.00
30	3.10	32	2.53	27	2.00
28	3.10	29	2.51	27	2.00
31	3.06	29	2.51	24	2.00
28	3.00	29	2.51	24	2.00
24	3.00	30	2.50	24	2.00
30	3.00	26	2.50	27	2.00
32	3.00	26	2.50	24	2.00
32	2.96	25	2.48	24	2.00
28	2.96	27	2.44	30	1.99
32	2.96	30	2.42	27	1.92
30	2.93	24	2.42	27	1.92
29	2.93	26	2.42	26	1.91
30	2.90	30	2.40	25	1.88
30	2.90	27	2.40	27	1.88

SPRING 1976 - DORMITORY STUDENTS
(Continued)

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
27	1.88	24	1.64	25	1.36
30	1.86	27	1.59	30	1.33
27	1.76	24	1.57	24	1.29
26	1.76	24	1.57	24	1.16
28	1.75	27	1.55	24	1.16
27	1.74	26	1.53	24	1.14
24	1.71	24	1.50	27	1.03
24	1.71	24	1.50	26	.76
24	1.66	28	1.46	24	.33
24	1.66	25	1.44	24	.12
24	1.66	24	1.40	24	.10
27	1.65	25	1.36		

SPRING 1976 - COMMUTER STUDENT
N = 103

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
34	4.00	30	3.10	30	2.30
27	3.88	31	3.09	30	2.26
25	3.87	23	3.05	24	2.25
32	3.87	29	3.03	26	2.23
24	3.83	24	3.00	31	2.22
29	3.68	26	2.92	28	2.21
31	3.64	30	2.90	31	2.16
30	3.63	27	2.88	24	2.14
32	3.62	26	2.88	30	2.13
28	3.57	31	2.87	24	2.13
35	3.51	25	2.84	26	2.12
31	3.51	25	2.82	24	2.10
26	3.50	26	2.80	31	2.09
26	3.50	30	2.80	24	2.04
25	3.48	28	2.77	24	2.00
30	3.46	26	2.74	24	2.00
28	3.46	27	2.74	24	2.00
31	3.42	24	2.73	27	1.92
30	3.40	30	2.73	25	1.84
24	3.37	25	2.68	25	1.80
25	3.36	29	2.68	27	1.70
28	3.35	27	2.66	26	1.57
24	3.34	27	2.66	29	1.51
27	3.33	31	2.64	31	1.51
28	3.32	27	2.62	24	1.38
25	3.30	31	2.61	29	1.34
28	3.25	30	2.60	26	1.20
27	3.22	30	2.60	24	1.14
30	3.20	32	2.53	24	1.12
31	3.19	32	2.53	24	.76
24	3.17	25	2.47	24	.72
32	3.15	32	2.46	26	.69
28	3.14	24	2.42	25	.54
24	3.13	29	2.40	28	.39
31	3.12				

SPRING 1977 - DORMITORY STUDENTS
N = 117

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDIT	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDIT	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
31	3.87	25	2.73	28	2.03
30	3.80	27	2.70	29	2.00
28	3.79	31	2.70	27	2.00
30	3.70	31	2.67	30	1.98
31	3.70	31	2.65	24	1.97
32	3.68	30	2.63	30	1.97
32	3.62	30	2.63	27	1.96
31	3.58	32	2.62	27	1.95
31	3.44	28	2.59	25	1.93
32	3.40	29	2.58	27	1.91
26	3.39	32	2.57	29	1.90
31	3.36	27	2.57	26	1.89
27	3.34	24	2.54	24	1.88
32	3.31	30	2.53	24	1.87
30	3.27	25	2.51	24	1.85
28	3.16	24	2.51	27	1.85
31	3.13	28	2.51	24	1.81
31	3.13	28	2.50	26	1.80
30	3.13	30	2.48	24	1.80
28	3.13	27	2.48	24	1.79
27	3.12	27	2.47	28	1.78
25	3.10	30	2.44	25	1.76
29	3.06	27	2.43	27	1.74
26	3.06	31	2.40	24	1.71
30	3.05	30	2.34	26	1.70
30	3.04	24	2.29	27	1.67
33	3.00	27	2.25	24	1.67
30	2.94	34	2.23	30	1.65
32	2.94	31	2.20	25	1.64
30	2.90	31	2.17	26	1.58
28	2.83	28	2.16	24	1.58
31	2.83	33	2.14	25	1.56
24	2.82	24	2.13	25	1.48
29	2.82	29	2.13	24	1.32
30	2.82	25	2.12	31	1.11
28	2.80	27	2.12	26	1.05
25	2.79	27	2.07	31	.96
27	2.77	28	2.06	24	.90
27	2.76	31	2.05	26	.89

SPRING 1977 - COMMUTING STUDENTS
N = 79

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
31	3.90	29	2.98	28	2.35
27	3.85	31	2.97	29	2.34
30	3.81	28	2.93	30	2.27
30	3.80	32	2.92	30	2.26
25	3.79	33	2.90	30	2.26
30	3.75	30	2.87	27	2.15
31	3.68	25	2.84	33	2.09
30	3.60	24	2.83	31	2.04
30	3.57	29	2.82	25	1.96
31	3.50	27	2.81	28	1.94
28	3.47	24	2.79	30	1.87
27	3.41	30	2.76	25	1.85
28	3.41	25	2.73	30	1.84
27	3.37	29	2.68	24	1.80
29	3.32	29	2.66	27	1.77
27	3.27	25	2.66	24	1.74
29	3.26	27	2.66	25	1.68
29	3.23	31	2.62	26	1.67
32	3.23	31	2.61	26	1.65
33	3.18	24	2.58	29	1.60
32	3.17	25	2.56	24	1.58
27	3.14	32	2.51	24	1.51
29	3.10	24	2.47	25	1.46
30	3.09	29	2.40	26	.92
28	3.01	31	2.38	29	.89
27	3.00	32	2.35	24	.66
34	3.00				

SPRING 1978 - DORMITORY STUDENTS
N = 130

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
32	3.74	27	2.64	26	1.81
24	3.62	30	2.64	30	1.81
29	3.61	30	2.63	24	1.75
33	3.57	30	2.61	30	1.74
31	3.45	25	2.60	27	1.74
28	3.39	28	2.58	27	1.74
30	3.29	30	2.54	25	1.72
27	3.15	30	2.53	25	1.68
31	3.13	31	2.52	27	1.67
31	3.13	28	2.52	29	1.65
28	3.11	29	2.51	27	1.63
32	3.10	28	2.51	27	1.63
30	3.10	28	2.50	26	1.62
29	3.04	28	2.50	24	1.58
29	3.04	31	2.47	30	1.58
30	3.03	31	2.44	31	1.57
30	3.02	33	2.32	26	1.56
27	3.02	29	2.32	25	1.56
30	3.01	25	2.28	25	1.54
27	3.01	29	2.26	24	1.53
30	3.00	28	2.22	29	1.50
29	2.97	24	2.21	24	1.47
24	2.97	32	2.19	29	1.47
30	2.97	27	2.18	24	1.44
32	2.92	26	2.16	24	1.42
33	2.92	27	2.14	24	1.40
30	2.92	30	2.07	27	1.37
26	2.88	28	2.06	29	1.37
27	2.82	29	2.06	25	1.34
26	2.81	25	2.02	24	1.26
31	2.80	32	2.02	26	1.22
29	2.80	26	2.01	25	1.16
32	2.78	24	2.00	27	1.15
30	2.77	29	2.00	28	1.15
30	2.77	26	2.00	27	1.12
31	2.75	26	2.00	24	1.12
29	2.75	31	1.96	29	1.09
24	2.72	24	1.94	25	.81
30	2.70	25	1.93	26	.72
27	2.70	31	1.86	27	.67
30	2.68	27	1.84	25	.61
26	2.68	25	1.83	28	.61
27	2.68	26	1.83	25	.00
28	2.65				

SPRING 1978 - COMMUTER STUDENTS
N = 98

CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE	CREDITS	GRADE POINT AVERAGE
28	3.87	30	2.79	24	2.21
25	3.82	25	2.78	24	2.19
30	3.81	24	2.70	31	2.19
25	3.71	30	2.70	28	2.17
27	3.68	30	2.70	29	2.15
32	3.64	24	2.70	24	2.10
33	3.62	30	2.67	26	2.10
31	3.61	27	2.65	30	2.09
29	3.53	30	2.64	24	1.99
28	3.45	30	2.62	30	1.97
28	3.43	24	2.58	27	1.91
24	3.38	30	2.57	30	1.90
31	3.36	26	2.57	25	1.84
30	3.33	32	2.56	27	1.84
24	3.30	25	2.52	30	1.84
30	3.25	27	2.51	25	1.80
30	3.18	30	2.50	31	1.80
27	3.17	24	2.47	27	1.76
28	3.16	28	2.47	30	1.75
30	3.16	24	2.41	24	1.74
25	3.15	33	2.39	27	1.71
30	3.13	24	2.38	24	1.66
24	3.12	26	2.36	34	1.58
29	3.11	24	2.35	24	1.55
26	3.08	31	2.33	30	1.53
28	3.06	27	2.33	24	1.48
29	3.06	31	2.33	28	1.35
24	3.05	26	2.31	24	1.35
29	3.03	32	2.28	30	1.11
24	2.96	30	2.27	25	.85
29	2.95	27	2.26	30	.77
27	2.94	30	2.24	24	.16
27	2.86	24	2.23		